

## REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on June 9, 2010 in which claims 27-32, 35 and 38 were withdrawn from consideration; in which claims 36 and 37 were objected to; and in which claims 1, 5-8, 10-16, 18 and 19 were rejected. This response is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. With this response, claims 8, 10, 11-16, 18-19, 27-28, 37 and 38 are canceled; claims 1, 5 and 36 are amended; and claims 39-42 are added. Claims 1, 5-7, 36 and 39-42 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

### I. Election Affirmation

Applicant hereby affirms the previous election of claims 1, 5-8, 9-16, 18, 19, 36 and 37 made on June 1, 2010.

### II. Rejection of claims 5, 13 and 18 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph

Page 3 of the Office Action rejected claims 5, 13 and 18 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as allegedly not complying with the written description requirement. In response, claims 13 and 18 are canceled. Claim 5 is amended to remove limitations related to the XML script. Claim 5, as amended, overcomes the rejection.

### III. Indicated Allowability of Former Claim 37

Page 6 of the Office Action indicated that claim 37 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. With this response, claim 37 is canceled with its limitations incorporated into former base claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 5-7 and claim 36 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

Applicants further note that claim 36 is amended to refer to the website and the first side of the firewall now recited in amended claim 1.

### IV. Added Claims

With this response, claims 39-42 are added. Claims 39-42 are believed to be patentably distinct over the prior art of record.

Claim 39 constitutes former objected to claim 36 rewritten in independent form including limitations of former base claim 1. Added claims 40-42 correspond to claims 5-7 which previously depended from claim 1. Applicants note that claim 40 is similar to claim 5 in that it omits limitations referring to an XML script.

V. Conclusion.

Claims 1, 5-7, 36 and 39-42 are now pending in this application.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Atty. Dkt. No. 10007582-1

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 9, 2010

By /Todd A. Rathe/

RATHE PATENT & IP LAW  
Customer No. 22879  
Telephone: (262) 478-9353  
Facsimile: (262) 238-1469

Todd A. Rathe  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,276